BEFORE THE
Federal Communications Commission
WASHINGTON, D.C.

In the matter of	)	
	)	
Joint Application by SBC Communications	)	
Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company,	)	
and Southwestern Bell Communications	)	CC Docket No. 00-217
Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long	)	
Distance for Provision of	)	
In-Region InterLATA Services	)	
in Kansas and Oklahoma	)	

AFFIDAVIT OF W. RICHARD MORRIS
ON BEHALF OF SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.

Introduction

1. My name is W. Richard Morris. My business address is 7301 College Boulevard, Overland Park, Kansas. I am the Vice President for External Affairs - Local Markets for Sprint. In this position, I have responsibility for interconnection contract negotiations with the incumbent local exchange companies and for providing regulatory counseling to Sprint as it enters competitive local markets.

2. I have worked for Sprint since 1990. At Sprint I have worked as a General Attorney providing regulatory and other legal counsel and as a Director in the regulatory policy area before accepting my current position. Before coming to Sprint I worked in the legal departments of Northwestern Bell Telephone Company and AT&T.

3. I submit this affidavit in response to the Joint Application of SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell

Communications Services, Inc. (collectively, "SWBT") to provide in-region, interLATA services in Kansas and Oklahoma.

4. This testimony addresses three issues relevant to SWBT's application. First, it describes the extent of Sprint's competitive presence in the Kansas local exchange market as of the date of SWBT's application. Second, it describes Sprint's experience with SWBT's ordering and provisioning processes for xDSL loops in Kansas. Third, it describes Sprint's experience with SWBT's provisioning of local number portability ("LNP") for Frame Due Time ("FDT") loops, which result in service outages for Sprint's customers 23% of the time.

Sprint's Residential Presence in Kansas

5. Sprint's Integrated On-demand Network ("ION") is Sprint's integrated service offering that includes local and long distance, voice and data, as a bundled product. It provides customers with an integrated platform that can be used simultaneously to carry broadband internet access, and local and long distance calling. Each customer has access to the Sprint ION Control Center, which allows end users to customize the functions of the customer's Sprint ION service. Currently, there are three Sprint ION residential product offerings - Sprint ION xt4, Sprint ION xt2, and Sprint ION Direct. Sprint ION xt4 uses ADSL access and provides a service with a maximum speed of 8.0 Mbps, up to 4 telephone lines, 750 minutes per month of long distance calling, and unlimited local calling. Sprint ION xt2 uses ADSL access and provides a service with a maximum speed of 8.0 Mbps, up to 2 telephone lines, 400 minutes per month of long distance calling, and unlimited local calling. Sprint ION Direct uses ADSL access to provide a data service with a maximum speed of 1.5 Mbps. The Sprint ION facilities are not an extension of Sprint's ILEC presence in Kansas, and in fact, are completely separate from Sprint's ILEC facilities.

6. Prior to the offering of service in specific markets, Sprint has engaged in an extended test period to ensure that its service offering will function seamlessly once it is commercially rolled-out. As explained more fully below, the testing process in Kansas consisted of three phases: an initial alpha test, a subsequent beta test, and finally a period in which customers were treated as "general availability" customers. Finally, after completion of the third phase, Sprint began offering ION on a commercial basis.

7. The testing in Kansas City began in 1999 to test Sprint ION xt4 service. At this time, only the Sprint ION xt4 service was available; the Sprint ION xt2 service was not introduced into the testing until August 2000.

8. The alpha test group was comprised of approximately 31 customers in Kansas. The alpha customers were Sprint employees and other "friendlies" (usually family members of Sprint employees) who were recruited by Sprint specifically for testing purposes. During the course of the alpha testing period, Sprint required the customers to conduct specific testing scenarios, which were designed for the purpose of testing specific aspects of the new Sprint ION technology. Alpha customers did not pay for ION service.

9. Between November 1999 and March 2000 Sprint established a second group of test customers -- the beta customers. There were approximately 123 additional beta customers in Kansas. As in the alpha phase, beta customers did not pay for the monthly ION service. Beta customers, however, were not required to conduct Sprint specified testing scenarios. Instead, this second test group was asked to use the Sprint ION service as any normal customer would, and provide feedback to Sprint about their experiences.

10. Alpha customers signed an agreement requiring nondisclosure of the Sprint ION service to the media or Sprint ION competitors. In addition, the alpha and beta customers signed

a test contract that required them to continue to subscribe to SWBT local exchange services until such time as Sprint notified the customer that the SWBT local exchange service could be disconnected and the number ported. This practice ensured that the test participants would continue to have local service even if they experienced problems with ION local service.

11. After March 15, 2000 Sprint accepted a few additional customers for its Kansas ION service, but this category of participants were still not commercial local customers as they received, but did not pay for the monthly Sprint ION service. (These customers would be, however, subject to charges for such ancillary services as directory assistance and operator services and some installation charges.) Furthermore, while some minority of total Kansas ION customers ported their back-up SWBT local exchange service lines over to Sprint (with material difficulties from SWBT, as discussed later), most continued to subscribe to SWBT local exchange service in addition to ION.

12. It was not until October 2000 that Sprint began to bill residential customers for the full complement of Sprint ION services, including local service. On October 20, 2000 Sprint first began sending bills to residential customers in Kansas assessing charges for Sprint ION monthly service charges. By that time, there were 173 Kansas residential customers in the Sprint ION billing system. On October 20, 2000, Sprint mailed bills to a total of 56 Sprint ION customers. By October 26, 2000, when I understand SBC filed with the FCC, there were 184 residential local Sprint ION users in Kansas. All of these customers had originally signed up for service during the pre-commercial stages of Sprint's entry in Kansas before billing for monthly ION service had commenced. Sprint also began the process of porting the remaining back-up, SWBT local exchange lines of its ION residential customers to Sprint. However, the porting

process has been extremely slow. As of October 26, 104 ION residential customers in Kansas had still not had their SWBT number ported to Sprint and their SWBT service removed.

xDSL Loop Ordering And Provisioning

13. The Sprint-specific data *reported by SWBT* for the provisioning of xDSL loops demonstrates problems that Sprint has experienced in obtaining nondiscriminatory provisioning of xDSL loops for ION. PM 60 - Percent Missed Due Dates Due to Lack of Facilities (xDSL) tracks the percentage of UNEs (xDSL loops) with missed committed due dates due to lack of facilities. In March, April, and May, 19.4%, 10.9%, and 4.5%, respectively, of Sprint's missed due dates were caused by lack of facilities. In contrast, for each of those months, SWBT missed only 0.1% due dates because of lack of facilities for its own orders. Similarly, in June and August, 11.8% and 9.5% of Sprint's missed due dates were caused by lack of facilities, compared to SWBT's 1.2% in June and 0% in August.

14. Furthermore, SWBT's data also indicates that it has consistently failed to provision xDSL loops for Sprint on the committed due date. PM 58 - Percent SWBT Caused Missed Due Dates (xDSL) measures the percentage of UNEs (DSL loops) for which installations are not completed by the committed due date. The reports for PM 58 show that SWBT has provided better service to itself five out of the seven months for which Sprint had orders (March -- 27.8 % of Sprint's due dates missed compared to 3.2% for SWBT; April -- 30.4% for Sprint compared to 9.6% for SWBT; July -- 7.4% for Sprint compared to 3.3% for SWBT; August -- 28.6% for Sprint compared to 3.1% for SWBT; September -- 5% for Sprint compared to 4.3% for SWBT). In addition, the average delay days for SWBT caused missed due dates experienced by Sprint exceeded that experienced by SWBT (PM No. 62) in March, April, and May by 8.53 days on average.

LNP Issues/Service Outages

15. As indicated earlier, most customers during the ION testing phases continued to subscribe to SWBT local exchange service in addition to ION. Indeed, even now that Sprint is entering the commercial phase of ION and is charging for the service, a significant number of customers continue to receive SWBT local service. Due in part to operational difficulties and in part to customer preference, Sprint cancelled a number of the early porting requests that occurred during the test phases. To ensure that customers would not suffer service outages while additional testing was conducted, Sprint subsequently instituted a temporary moratorium on any porting on August 2, 2000. While Sprint continued to install ION during this period, it did not resume porting again until October 19, 2000. On that date, Sprint began the process of porting the remaining back-up, SWBT local exchange lines of its ION residential customers to Sprint, a process which, as I noted earlier, is still underway.

16. Sprint is unable within the time frames given to determine the number of porting requests it placed with SWBT specifically for Kansas, but SWBT's performance measurement reports (PMs 114, 114.1, and 115) for Sprint indicate that SWBT ported 30 FDT LNP orders for Sprint in August and September. Sprint's own records show that its customers experienced service outages 23% of the time. All of the service outages resulted directly from SWBT's failure to process cancellation requests in a timely manner. In each instance, Sprint submitted a cancellation order and received either written or verbal confirmation from SWBT that the cancellation order had been received and would be processed. Despite these confirmations, customers that had their port dates rescheduled (or otherwise had requested different port dates) experienced service outages.

17. These problems do not appear on the SWBT performance measurement results because there is no measurement that reports failure to process cancellation orders. (While precise data are not available because Sprint did not track LNP problems until late July 2000, Sprint employees experienced similar difficulties in June, the only other month for which SWBT reports FDT LNP cutovers.) As discussed earlier, these problems needlessly created additional problems for Sprint in bringing Sprint ION to market.

DECLARATION

Pursuant to the Commission's rules under 47 C.F.R. § 1.16, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on November 15, 2000.

W. Richard Morris
Sprint Communications Company, L.P.